

**MINUTES**  
**OF**  
**THE UTAH RADIATION CONTROL BOARD**

**October 6, 2006**

**Department of Environmental Quality, DEQ Building #2**

**Conference Room 101**

**168 N 1950 W**

**Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4850**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Kent J. Bradford, P.G., Chair  
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Director of DEQ  
Dane L. Finerfrock, Executive Secretary  
Patrick D. Cone  
Frank D. DeRosso, MSPH, C.I.H.  
Elizabeth Goryunova, M.S.  
Peter A. Jenkins  
Joette E. Langianese, Commissioner  
Joseph K. Miner, M.D., MSPH  
Gregory G. Oman, D.D.S., B.S.  
Robert S. Pattison, B.Sc.

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT/EXCUSED**

Stephen T. Nelson, Ph.D., Vice Chair  
John W. Thomson, M.D.

**DRC STAFF/OTHER DEQ MEMBERS PRESENT**

Philip Griffin, DRC Staff  
Brian Hamos, DRC Staff  
David Hogge, DRC Staff  
John Hultquist, DRC Staff  
Craig Jones, DRC Staff  
Laura Lockhart, Attorney General's Office  
Loren Morton, DRC Staff  
Yoli Necochea, DRC Staff  
Fred Nelson, Attorney General's Office  
William (Bill) J. Sinclair, Deputy Director  
Donna Spangler, DEQ/Policy and Planning

**PUBLIC**

J. Ban, Ban Law/Sierra Club  
Judy Fayhes, Salt Lake Tribune  
David Frydenlund, IUC (USA) Inc.  
John K. Hayes, M.D., RSO, Medical  
Director, GammaWest Brachytherapy  
Steve Landau, IUC (USA) Inc.  
Karen S. Langley, University of Utah  
Mark Ledoux, EnergySolutions, LLC  
R. Sercross, L.W.V.  
Vanessa Pierce, HEAL - Utah  
James L. Sweet, M.S., RSO, GammaWest  
Brachytherapy  
Christopher Thomas, HEAL - Utah  
Michael A. Zody, Parsons, Behle, Latimer  
M. Zipser, League of Woman Voters

## **GREETINGS/MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

The Utah Radiation Control Board convened in the Department of Environmental Quality, Room 101, 168 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, Utah. Kent Bradford, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:11 p.m. Kent Bradford, Chair, welcomed the Board Members and the public to the meeting. He indicated that if the public wished to address any items on the agenda, they should sign the public sign-in sheet. Those desiring to comment would be given an opportunity to address their concerns during the public comment period.

### **I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Board Action Item)**

#### **a. Approval of Minutes and Transcript from the September 8, 2006 Board Minutes**

Kent J. Bradford asked the Board for corrections to the September 8, 2006 minutes. Gregory Oman proposed the following corrections to the minutes.

1. Page 5, Item V., a., seventh paragraph on this page, quoted by Stephen T. Nelson which reads "Is it safe to say that, that **\$400,00.00** annual figure . . ." **Change to read: . . . that \$400,000.00 . . ."**

**MOTION MADE BY FRANK DEROSSO TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2006, WITH THE REQUESTED CORRECTION, SECONDED BY ELIZABETH GORYUNOVA.**

**MOTION CARRIED AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **II. RULES (Board Action Item)**

#### **a. Final Rulemaking Notice for Rules: R313-12, 14, 16, and 22**

Philip Griffin, Health Physicist, informed the Board Members that during the August 4, 2006 Board Meeting the Board approved the draft revisions for Rules R313-12, R313-14, R313-16, and R313-22. The Board directed Division Staff to submit the proposed rule changes to the Division of Administrative Rules and open a 30-day public comment period. The public comment period opened September 1, 2006 and closed October 3, 2006. During the comment period, no comments were received for any of the rules regarding the proposed rule changes.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Executive Secretary recommends that the Board approve the proposed changes to the Utah Radiation Control Rules and direct DRC Staff to file the changes for final rulemaking with an effective date of October 20, 2006. The

amended rules will then be published in the Utah State Bulletin on November 15, 2006.

**MOTION MADE BY ELIZABETH GORYUNOVA TO APPROVE  
THE UTAH RADIATION CONTROL RULES R313-12, 14, 16, and 22  
AND TO MAKE THE EFFECTIVE DATE OCTOBER 20, 2006,  
SECONDED BY PATRICK D. CONE.**

**MOTION CARRIED AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**III. RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS LICENSING/INSPECTION  
(Board Action Item)**

**a. Request by GammaWest Brachytherapy for Exemption to the  
Rule 313-32 (Incorporating 10 CFR 35.51(b)(1) by Reference)**

Craig Jones, Manager, informed the Board that this is an action item which relates to an exemption request by GammaWest Brachytherapy (GWB). This company has a licensee that authorizes the use of radioactive material for medical use. They use a device called a high-dose rate (HDR) afterloader unit for cancer treatments.

Craig explained that an authorized medical physicist and certain other individuals must be physically present during the initiation and during continuation of medical treatments of patients involving an HDR unit. The licensee has asked for Mr. Jeffery Jones to be named on three radioactive material licenses as an authorized medical physicist (AMP), and Mr. Jeffery Jones' approval will be limited to brachytherapy services only.

Craig Jones reported that the Division of Radiation Control's Staff had reviewed the training and experience of Mr. Jeffery Jones, and concluded that he has not met some specific requirements established in the Administrative Code. Mr. Craig Jones discussed the regulatory requirements and he identified the specific areas where Mr. Jeffery Jones did not qualify for approval.

Craig explained that required training and experience must be acquired before an individual may perform, without supervision, the duties and services of an AMP. Mr. Jeffrey Jones would also need to be named on the radioactive material licenses through license amendments approved by the Executive Secretary. Craig informed the Board that GWB sent a letter, dated September 20, 2006 asking that the Board exempt Mr. Jeffery Jones from the rules requiring him to complete the required period of training and experience. GammaWest Brachytherapy also asked that the Board approve Mr. Jeffrey Jones as an AMP.

Craig discussed the authority the Board had to grant exceptions or exemptions to requirements of the Radiation Control Rules. He pointed out that, in the past, the Executive Secretary had predominately recommended that the Board should deny a request for exemption or exceptions to the rules.

Kent Bradford, Chair, introduced James L. Sweet, M.S., RSO, and John K. Hayes, M.D., RSO, from GammaWest Brachytherapy and asked them to address the Board. They distributed a handout to the Board and they proceeded to discuss their exemption request.

**GammaWest Brachytherapy Speakers:**

Mr. James L. Sweet asked the Board if they had any questions regarding the handout or their letter of September 22, 2006 and the associated supporting documentation. There were no questions. Mr. Sweet said that GWB believes Mr. Jeffery Jones had met the training and experience criteria, and he made the following points:

- (1) GammaWest Brachytherapy has three clinics and they are located in Salt Lake City, Ogden, and Orem, Utah. He said that GWB had two physicists, and it makes it very difficult to perform quality work in a safe manner when they have patients at three clinics. He also noted that patients have to be treated twice a day, with a six hour period between treatments. Consequently, the physicists are driving up and down Interstate-15 all day long to be at each of these treatments.
- (2) GammaWest Brachytherapy feels that Mr. Jones is trained adequately to be named on the licenses, and he is thoroughly qualified as an authorized medical physicist in brachytherapy services.
- (3) GammaWest Brachytherapy is asking that Mr. Jeffery Jones be allowed to perform brachytherapy services only. Any external-beam services (machine generated radiation) will be performed under the supervision of an authorized medical physicist. The condition they are requesting is that Mr. Jones does work only with the high-dose rate afterloader units.
- (5) GammaWest Brachytherapy feels that the way the regulations are written gives latitude for the Board to look at specific cases and to grant exemptions. They are asking the Board to look at the facts and then grant, based on the facts, an appropriate exemption.

Mr. Sweet elaborated on the training and experience of Mr. Jeffrey Jones as follows:

- (1) Mr. Jeffery Jones has a degree in medical physics from a certified program.

- (2) He has had thorough training in the use of high-dose rate afterloader units. Even though the 24-months of combined training and experience may have not been satisfied, all of the training and experience that he has obtained far exceeds the average for a medical physicist in the field. The services of GammaWest Brachytherapy focus on the use of high-dose rate afterloader units. Mr. Sweet said that he feels that additional months of training and experience would not serve a good purpose.
- (3) Mr. Jones has spent two years in medical physics training at a hospital where they have high energy linear accelerators and where they do brachytherapy. Mr. Jones has come to GammaWest Brachytherapy very well qualified in many respects compared to scientists who have a master's degree or a doctor's degree in physical science, engineering, or applied mathematics.
- (4) GammaWest Brachytherapy patients have to be treated twice a day, and they have a six hour interval between treatments. Mr. Jones has performed, under the supervision of other AMPs, more brachytherapy procedures than a typical AMP would in a life time at other cancer centers.
- (5) GammaWest Brachytherapy can verify that Mr. Jones has completed 400 cases of brachytherapy services in eight months. Verification of the 400 cases can be determined through the recordkeeping of patient names and numbers, if necessary.

#### **Discussion and Questions by the Board Followed:**

The Board discussed how much training and experience Mr. Jeffrey Jones had obtained. The purpose of this discussion was to determine if he were qualified to be an AMP.

Dr. Joseph K. Miner, M.D., MSPH, asked for clarification, if the Board denied the request. He wanted to know if, after four or nine months of additional training and additional experience, this individual could be allowed to observe brachytherapy services as a medical physicist.

Mr. James L. Sweet responded that this was correct. He said after a full 24-months, they would come back and resubmit his training.

#### **MOTION BY THE BOARD AND THE FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION:**

Dr. Miner said that, whatever the Board decides, it has to be consistent in future applications. He mentioned that individuals need to be "similarly qualified," and follow some kind of measurement--like the number of procedures before a limited approval could be granted. Gregory G. Oman agreed. He did not want

a Board decision in this case to “open up the flood gates” and encourage a lot of supplemental requests to come before the Board.

Much discussion followed about any need to amend the rules. There was continued discussion, regarding the need for the Board to be consistent in its decision process. Peter A. Jenkins asked whether the level of patient safety might be affected by minimizing the regulatory requirements, and if the Board could arbitrate the change that minimizes the standard of care, without some revision of the rule. He noted that the present requirements, adopted by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and incorporated by the State, represents an increase in the amount of training and experience compared to the previous regulatory requirements. The GammaWest Brachytherapy representative responded that they believed Mr. Jones was “thoroughly over qualified,” because he had completed over 400 cases at their three facilities.

Kent Bradford, Chair, called for a vote on this item. Kent verified who was still on the phone and he found that Dianne Nielson, Director, was no longer on conference call. This left nine voting Board Members for this item.

**JOSEPH MINER, M.D., MADE A MOTION THAT THE BOARD GRANT AN EXCEPTION AND ALLOW LIMITED RESTRICTED APPROVAL FOR JEFFERY JONES, MEDICAL PHYSICIST AT GAMMAWEST BRACHYTHERAPY, SECONDED BY GREGORY OMAN, DDS.**

**THE FOLLOWING BOARD MEMBERS VOTED YES:**

- (1) KENT J. BRADFORD, P.G., CHAIR**
- (2) FRANK D. DEROSSO, MSPH, C.I.H.**
- (3) JOSEPH K. MINER, M.D., MSPH**
- (4) GREGORY G. OMAN, DDS, B.S.**
- (5) ROBERT S. PATTISON, B. S.**

**THE FOLLOWING VOTED NO:**

- (6) PETER A. JENKINS**
- (7) PATRICK D. CONE**
- (8) JOETTE E. LANGIANESE, COMMISSIONER**

**THERE WAS ONE ABSTAINMENT TO THE VOTE:**

- (9) ELIZABETH GORYUNOVA, M.S.**

**JOSEPH MINER, M.D., AMENDED HIS MOTION AND ASKED FOR THE BOARD TO APPROVE THE EXEMPTION REQUEST AND MAKE AMENDMENTS TO GAMMAWEST BRACHYTHERAPY’S RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL LICENSES UT1800164, UT2500453, AND UT2900449 TO INCLUDE MR. JEFFERY JONES AS AN AUTHORIZED MEDICAL PHYSICIST (AMP) WITH THE CONDITION THAT MR JONES’**

**AUTHORIZATION WILL BE FOR BRACHYTHERAPY SERVICES ONLY,  
SECONDED BY GREGORY OMAN, DDS.**

**MOTION CARRIED AND WAS APPROVED**

**IV. X-RAY REGISTRATION/INSPECTION**

No Items

**V. RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL (Board Action Items)**

**a. Status of the “Perpetual Care Report”**

Kent Bradford, Chair, updated the Board on the “Perpetual Care Report.” Chairman Bradford said the report had been completed and submitted, by the consultant, to the Legislature on September 29, 2006.

He said the report was made public on the Division’s Web Site on October 4, 2006. You can go on-line to view and download the report. Kent Bradford said he and the Chair of the Division of Solid Hazardous Waste Board would attend the Legislative Interim Committee Meeting on November 15, 2006. He said he would answer any questions the Legislature may have regarding the “Perpetual Care Report.”

**b. License Amendment Request from EnergySolutions to Modify the Disposal Embankment Design and Combine Class A Cells (Board Information item)**

John Hultquist, Manager, said EnergySolutions submitted an amendment request to combine two disposal cells. He said he would refer to EnergySolutions’ amendment request as the Class A Combined (CAC). John Hultquist discussed EnergySolutions’ proposed design-modifications. The following outline was presented by Mr. Hultquist to the Board:

- Class A Combined (CAC) Cell  
The CAC cell is conceptually the same design as the Class A and Class A North.  
Primarily an above grade landfill embankment.  
The CAC occupies the same footprint as the two other cells and the corridor between them (Class A and Class A North)
- CAC Design Features
  - Merge the approved Class A and Class A North Cells into a single disposal unit called the Class A Combined (CAC) cell.
  - Convert open space between the Class A and Class A North disposal embankments for waste disposal.
  - Increase maximum disposal embankment height from 39 and 59 feet to 83 feet above natural grade

- Design Features Comparison
  - DRC Approved Disposal Cells for Class A and Class A North
  - Top of Waste/ Top of Riprap
  - Increase total disposal capacity at the site from about 8.8 to 13.1 million cubic feet.
- CAC Design Features
  - Type B Filter in the CAC disposal unit cover system is 24 inches rather than 6 inches thick.
  - The surface water drainage system basically remains unchanged, although ditches in the corridor between the Class A and CAN cells are eliminated.
- Class A Combined (CAC) Footprint
  - Map outline of Class A Combined: Class A North and Class A
- CAC Design Features
  - Map outline of Class A and Class A North
- DAC Cover Design
  - Detail Map outline of Class A and Class A North: Road/Ditch Detail, Detail Side-Slope, Top Slope, and Ditch Detail
- CAC Review
  - Characteristics and design of the embankment
  - Physical performance of the embankment
  - Radiological performance of the disposal system
  - Radiological Environmental Monitoring Location: Soil Stations, Air Stations and Groundwater Wells
  - Map outline of Class A North, Class A and 11e(2)
- CAC Review Conclusions
  - Groundwater quality standards will be satisfied for 500 and 200 years for radioactive and non- radioactive constituents.
  - Potential doses to members of the public from development and operations
- CAC Review and Public Comment Period
  - DRC is currently soliciting public comments on a proposal to amend an existing Radioactive Materials License and Ground Water Discharge Permit for the EnergySolutions facility near Clive, Utah.
  - A 30-day Public Comment Period is underway and has been extended 30 additional days and will close on Friday, November 10, 2006.
  - As part of the public comment period, two public hearings are scheduled for October 11, 2006:
    - (1) Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Bldg. #2, Conference Room 101, 168 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, UT, 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.



- (2) Tooele County Health Department, Conference Room  
162, 151 North Main Street, Tooele, UT, 7:00 p.m. to  
9:00 p.m.

**c. Report on Disposed Waste at EnergySolutions**

Loren Morton, Manager, discussed waste volumes disposed of at EnergySolutions. He discussed how volumes and “activities of waste” are measured. Mr. Morton discussed variables and uncertainties regarding waste volumes. He continued by making comparisons of volumes and capacities. Next, Mr. Morton brought his analysis together with some conclusions. (Attached is a Copy of Loren’s Slide Presentation)

**VI. URANIUM MILL TAILINGS UPDATE (Board Action Item)**

**a. Request for Agency Action -- Glen Canyon Group, Sierra Club**

**(1) Board Decision on Petition to Intervene**

Kent Bradford, Chair, reported that Fred Nelson, from the Attorney General’s Office, would be updating the Board on the next two items.

Fred Nelson, Esq., brought two documents before the Board for approval. He said at the September 8, 2006 Board Meeting the Board made a decision allowing the Glen Canyon Group of the Sierra Club to intervene and present their issues with respect to a license amendment to the International Uranium (USA) Corporation’s (IUC) license.

Fred Nelson, Esq., explained that the decision must be issued in writing. Mr. Nelson prepared the written decision, which he circulated to the Board and DRC Staff. He said the written decision he prepared was ready for signature, if it accurately reflected the Board’s “Oral Determination” at the September 8, 2006 Meeting.

**MOTION MADE BY GREGORY OMAN TO APPROVE THE WRITTEN DECISION ON THE SIERRA CLUB’S PETITION TO INTERVENE, SECONDED BY ELIZABETH GORYUNOVA**

**THERE WAS ONE ABSTENTION TO THE VOTE BY JOSEPH MINER WHO WAS NOT AT THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2006 BOARD MEETING.**

**MOTION CARRIED AND PASSED**

**(2) Stipulated Order and Schedule**

Fred Nelson, Attorney General's Office, asked the Board to approve the Stipulated Order and Schedule. The Board asked the Parties to reach an agreement on the schedule for the hearing. Fred Nelson, Esq., reported the Parties had reached an agreement on the schedule.

Fred Nelson, Esq., said the Parties propose, between now and January 26, 2007, "discovery." The Parties will file any motions they have with the Board, and establish a date for preparing the administrative record. The dates are listed in the proposed order with a one-day hearing scheduled on January 26, 2007. Fred Nelson, Esq., stated he believed the schedule to be reasonable, and recommended the Board accept the schedule.

Kent Bradford, Chair, called for a motion to accept the proposed Stipulated Order and Schedule.

**MOTION MADE BY FRANK DEROSSO TO APPROVE THE  
STIPULATED ORDER AND SCHEDULE, SECONDED BY  
ELIZABETH GORYUNOVA**

**MOTION CARRIED AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**VII. OTHER DIVISION ISSUES**

No Items

**VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS BY:**

**(1) FIRST PUBLIC SPEAKER:**

**Christopher Thomas, HEAL Utah Policy Director**, made the following comments to the Board:

Mr. Thomas said he was concerned about the waste volume inventory presented by Loren Morton, DRC Manager. He said Utah Code R19-3-105 set a threshold for added legislative and gubernatorial review for particular license amendments. Going over the EnergySolutions' Capacity Table, the capacity of radioactive waste has increased more than 50%, several-times, over the years. Mr. Thomas said license amendments to increase waste volumes at EnergySolutions have not triggered legislative and gubernatorial review.

Kent Bradford, Chair, asked Laura Lockhart from the Attorney General's Office to respond to Mr. Thomas' question.

Laura Lockhart, Attorney General's Office, said that she represented the Executive Secretary. She said there was a license amendment "up for public comment" that would "squarely erase the issue." She said there would be public comments on both sides of the issue of whether it would be appropriate to include a provision on the final use of the EnergySolutions' waste cells. Although this issue could have come-up on previous occasions, it did not; consequently, the Executive Secretary has never considered this issue in the context of a license application.

The Executive Secretary is legally obligated to fairly analyze all public comments. It is not appropriate for the Radiation Control Board to "jump ahead" and make a determination at this time. Laura Lockhart, Esq., respectfully suggested they follow administrative rules and statutes. She said after the public comment, the Radiation Control Board would issue a decision. After the Board's decision, if anyone is interested, they could begin a formal adjudicated procedure.

Christopher Thomas, HEAL Utah, asked if waste inventories were primarily received from EnergySolutions. He asked if the DRC did "fact checking" regarding the volumes of waste that are reported by EnergySolutions.

Dane Finerfrock, Executive Secretary, responded to this question. He said EnergySolutions pays a fee for each cubic foot of radioactive waste they receive. DEQ audits the 540 Uniform Low-Level Radioactive Waste Manifests, and compares the waste amounts to the fees Radiation Control receives. Kent Bradford, Chair, said DEQ's "waste inventories" were prepared by DEQ Staff not by EnergySolutions.

Christopher Thomas, HEAL Utah, asked, asked how the Division verified that the description of waste on the manifest matched the actual waste that was shipped and received at EnergySolutions?

Dane Finerfrock, Executive Secretary, said prior to receiving a shipment for disposal, EnergySolutions is required to make an early determination that EnergySolutions is licensed to receive the waste. They receive early samples of the waste to confirm its nature. EnergySolutions also samples the waste when it arrives, and they confirm the waste they receive is the same as the early samples. The analysis includes the types of concentrations and quantities of radioactive material and the physical and chemical nature of the radioactive waste.

Christopher Thomas, HEAL Utah, asked if the sampling that EnergySolutions conducts confirms what is reported on the waste manifest. He asked that if the

EnergySolutions sampling did not confirm the waste manifest, if the waste would be returned at that point?

Dane Finerfrock, Executive Secretary, responded yes. That was possible.

Christopher Thomas, HEAL Utah, voiced his concern about the liner in the waste cells. He said the liner might become vulnerable by added stress on the seams. He said the added stress would not exist, if the layers of clay liner were added one after another.

Kent Bradford, Chair, said Mr. Thomas' concerns were valid. He said the Division of Radiation Control was doing an "engineering review" of the proposed, new design for the combined cells. He said the Division would be looking at those issues. He said it was part of the engineering review. He said there would be more discussion on this issue as the license amendment is considered.

Kent Bradford, Chair, asked the next speaker to address the Board and the public.

(2) **SECOND PUBLIC SPEAKER:**

**Tye Rogers, EnergySolutions**, said he wanted to bring out some points from Loren Morton's presentation. He said to refer to page 18, of Mr. Morton's slide presentation: "ES Capacity Comparisons."

The current EnergySolutions' permit's total design is for 8.8 million. EnergySolutions has used 5 million of that. There is 3 million left. Loren Morton's review stated that EnergySolutions had used 60% of their capacity. EnergySolutions has been operating for 18 years, during those 18 years there has been a lot of Department of Energy (DOE) cleanup projects. EnergySolutions has taken large volumes of DOE waste. Tye Rogers said he wanted to talk a little bit about the future. He said Rocky Flats, which is a major DOE cleanup project, has been completed. Fernald is also being completed this year. If you look at the EnergySolutions' forecast Fernald's volume is starting to decrease dramatically.

Last year, EnergySolutions had 25 million cubic feet. This year EnergySolutions will receive about 16 million cubic feet. Next year, it is looking like ("and these are just forecasts"), EnergySolutions will receive 13 or 14 million cubic feet. EnergySolutions is taking a trend down. The future waste volumes, cannot be predicted using waste volumes from the past--especially in the low-level radioactive waste industry.

Mr. Rogers clarified that over the years EnergySolutions had started to utilize their cell space a lot more efficiently. In 2004 and especially 2005,

EnergySolutions made most of its efficiency improvements. EnergySolutions is making more improvements in 2006. The waste that EnergySolutions has already received has been further compacted scientifically. EnergySolutions bought a new compactor. The waste is gone-over, back and forth and compacted at 90% to 95%, depending on the type of waste. There has been a dramatic decrease in volume from what is manifested to what actually goes in the cell, and you can see that with the 75%.

The volumes are going down. EnergySolutions is utilizing cell-space a lot more efficiently, and is anticipating the new, cell-amendment. The cell-amendment will significantly increase the waste EnergySolutions currently has. But, EnergySolutions has been operating 18 years, and Mr. Tye Rogers said he stood by his statement: there is over 20 years left of capacity.

Christopher Thomas, HEAL Utah, asked if the estimate was in cubic feet?

Tye Rogers, EnergySolutions, thanked Mr. Thomas for his correction.

**Additional Questions by the Board:**

Patrick Cone asked if EnergySolutions was anticipating taking the Idaho cleanup-project from the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL), and finding a place for INEEL's low-level radioactive waste.

Tye Rogers, EnergySolutions, responded that they had been talking to INEEL, but INEEL has 18 million cubic feet--and they projected less than 13 million cubic feet next year. This, Mr. Rogers assumed, would be the waste from INEEL as well as other cleanup projects around the country.

Kent Bradford, Chair, asked if there were any other questions.  
There were no other questions.

**IX. OTHER ISSUES**

**Next Scheduled Board Meeting: December 1, 2006, DEQ Bldg #2, Conference Room 101, 168 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2:00 – 4:00 P.M.**

**MOTION WAS MADE BY GREGORY OMAN TO ADJOURN THE BOARD MEETING, SECONDED BY JOSEPH MINER.**

**MOTION CARRIED AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**THE BOARD MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:59 P.M.**